

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/749,005	12/30/2003	Gregor K. Frey	6570P028	8386	
	8791 DI AVELV SC	7590 02/26/2007 NOTOEE TAVIOR & 7.4	EXAM	EXAMINER		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			IIIIII	ROCHE, TI	ROCHE, TRENTON J	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	DOG / HIVODD	35, 011 70023 1030		2193	2193	
	SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 02/26/		02/26/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/749,005	FREY ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Trenton J. Roche	2193				
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence a	ddress			
A SHO WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPAIR IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Deriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staply received by the Office later than three months after the main patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep tod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)	 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 December 2003</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) ∑ This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Dispositio	on of Claims						
5)□ (6)⊠ (7)□ (Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application	on Papers						
9)□ T 10)⊠ T	The specification is objected to by the Exame The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 in Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the confine oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ of the drawing(s) be held in abeyanc rection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 (CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) eation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s).	immary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application -				

Art Unit: 2193

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office action is responsive to communications filed December 30, 2003.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Objections

- 3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim improperly depends on itself. Appropriate correction is required. For purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes the claim is supposed to depend on claim 5.
- 4. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim improperly depends on a later claim, that of claim 9. Appropriate correction is required. For purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes the claim is supposed to depend on claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

- 8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
 - Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 9. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
- 10. The invention as disclosed in claims 1-12 is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc., 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02.)

Art Unit: 2193

Page 3

8. Claims 1-12 are directed to a system comprising one or more log controllers for receiving one or more messages from an application, and a log manager coupled to the log controllers. No physical aspects of the system are disclosed however, and as such, the recited log controllers and log manager, and thus the "system," amount to nothing more than software or a computer program listing per se, in that none of the elements recited are computer components or statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and hardware elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and as such are considered functional descriptive material not capable of execution and thus are not capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result as required by the State Street Formulation. It is recommended that the claims be amended to show interactions between the hardware components of the system (processor, hard drive, etc.) and the log controllers/log manager/logs (being executed/stored/etc. by the hardware).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,802,067 to Camp et al. ("Camp").

Art Unit: 2193

Per claim 1:

Camp discloses:

- one or more log controllers to receive one or more messages from an application wherein

each of the log controllers is a Java class that includes one or more subclasses or modules

Page 4

selected from a group comprising a category subclass to generate trace messages and a

location subclass to generate trace messages ("the public in terface to the message logging

framework is log interface 10 and log base class 15..." in col. 2 lines 58-59. Further,

"Console log class...file log class...null log class...are classed representing specific types of

logging destination...each of which extends log base class..." in col. 3 lines 17-20. Finally,

"written in the Java programming language..." in col. 5 lines 26-27.)

a log manager coupled to the log controllers to manage the log controllers ("log manager..."

in col. 4 line 65)

- one or more logs to which the received messages are forwarded ("logs messages to a file..."

in col. 3 line 24)

substantially as claimed.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses storing logs in a database as

claimed (note col. 3 lines 27-31).

Per claim 5:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses a formatter as claimed (Note col. 4 lines 11-43.)

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 5. The transaction formatter is a trace formatter.

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses each of the logs include one oe more subclasses or modules selected from a group comprising a stream log, a file log, and a console log as claimed ("Console log class...file log class..." in col. 3 line 17).

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses the file log and console log being subclasses of the stream log as claim ("Console log class...file log class...null log class...are classed representing specific types of logging destination...each of which extends log base class..." in col. 3 lines 17-20).

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses severity information as claimed ("severity message..." in col. 3 line 42).

Per claim 10:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, Camp discloses severity selected from a list comprising debug, path, info, warning, error, fatal and none as claimed (Note col. 3 lines 55-65).

Per claim 11:

Note the rejection of claim 10. Further, "Log base class 15 provides a means to process messages based upon their severity attributes, for example through filtering or monitoring methods." in col. 3 lines 32-34. As the base class is extended, the severity would be inherited by the classes that extend the base class.)

Per claim 12:

Note the rejection regarding claim 11. Further, note col. 3 line 66 to col. 4 line 10, which discloses the ability to restrict severity messages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camp.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, while Camp discloses the use of the Java language, Camp does not explicitly disclose a Java 2 Enterprise Edition (J2EE) engine. Office

Art Unit: 2193

Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the logging abilities of Camp in a J2EE environment, as this is simply a more specific application development environment based on Java, and is well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Such a combination would be obvious as it would allow a developer of a distributed Java system the capability of debugging the system.

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Camp does not explicitly disclose logging routines for a kernel. Camp discloses that message logging is useful and "needed in development of software code and application to assist with testing, debugging, trouble shooting and the like." (Col. 1 lines 12-15). Office Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the logging abilities of Camp to log routines for a kernel, as this would enable a software developer to determine what is happening on the kernel level of the system in terms of debugging.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Trenton J Roche Examiner Art Unit 2193

TJR